

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 8, 2009, Applicant submits the following remarks. Claims 1, 11 and 20 have been amended. New claims 31-33 have been added.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 13, 14, 17-20, 22, 23, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Goodisman et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069223, hereinafter "Goodisman") in view of Golovchinsky et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078757, hereinafter "Golovchinsky").

In the Office Action, the examiner stated that Goodisman did not describe identifying a target document relating to the text reference, where the identifying includes performing a search using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from the text reference and selecting the target document from one or more search results responsive to the query, as recited by claim 1. (Office Action at p. 3.) Neither did Golovchinsky.

Golovchinsky described a mechanism that allows users to defer hyperlink following in a document by detecting the reader's interest in a particular external document through their free-form markings and annotations, and processing these detected marks in various ways. (Golovchinsky at [0014].) In general, two different kinds of processing are supported: (1) using the reader's marks on or near hypertext link anchors--annotated anchors--to define a collection of documents of interest from all possible external document references that the reader encounters; and (2) using these marks to help the reader visualize the interconnections of interest. (See id.)

The examiner relied on the following portion of Golovchinsky for the proposition that Golovchinsky described identifying a target document relating to the text reference, where the identifying includes performing a search using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from the text reference and selecting the target document from one or more search results responsive to the query ([0018], emphasis added):

An additional component of the system of the invention is the processing which may occur on the annotated anchors once detected. Such processing includes: generating a list illustrating the documents that are targets of annotated anchors,

with or without the annotation metadata, to allow for deferred link following; constraining the list illustrating the target documents; searching a document database for documents containing one or more references to these target documents; pre-fetching documents from a document database; allowing propagation of the annotations to other anchors which reference the same target in the same document or in other documents and/or hypertext structures; and suppressing or enhancing links based on defined annotation structures. The list may be generated from any serializable structure, such as hierarchical, spatial, sequential, etc.

However, the above-quoted portion of Golovchinsky did not describe performing a search using a search engine in which the search is based on a query derived from the text reference. Moreover, while Golovchinsky mentioned “searching a document database” and “pre-fetching documents from a document database,” there was no mention of doing so based on a query derived from a text reference. In fact, the word “query” does not appear anywhere in Golovchinsky. As such, neither Golovchinsky nor Goodisman described, nor would their combination have made obvious, these features of claim 1. Claims 11 and 20 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given in connection with claim 1.

Claims 6, 15, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Goodisman and Golovchinsky as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Glover et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0221163, hereinafter “Glover”).

Claims 6, 15, and 24 are not obvious in view of Golovchinsky or Goodisman, as addressed above in regards to the claims from which they depend. The applied portion of Glover did not remedy the deficiencies in Golovchinsky or Goodisman. Accordingly, claims 6, 15, and 24 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 16, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Goodisman, Golovchinsky, and Glover as applied to claim 6 above and further in view of Hennings et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,496, hereinafter “Hennings”).

Claims 7, 16, and 25 are not obvious in view of Golovchinsky or Goodisman, as addressed above in regards to the claims from which they depend. The applied portion of Hennings did not remedy the deficiencies in Golovchinsky or Goodisman. Accordingly, claims 7, 16, and 25 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable. Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, Applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, Applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that Applicant agrees with any positions taken by the Examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

The required RCE fee of \$810.00, excess claim fees of \$104.00, and a petition for a two-month extension of time for \$490.00 are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2010_____

/Daniel J. Burns/_____
Daniel J. Burns
Reg. No. 50,222

Customer Number 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945